

INDEX
MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
15 October 1963

	Page
ADMINISTRATION	
1. Approval of Minutes	1
2. Date of Next Meeting	1
3. Budget Estimate, Fiscal Year 1965	1-2
4. Resignation of Miss Gertrude Sawyer from the Old Georgetown Board of Architural Consultants	2
SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS	
1. National Capital Downtown Committee Area Redevelopment Program	2
2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service	
a. Federal Office Building No. 5 - Revised Design	3-4
b. Brooklyn, N.Y. Federal Office Building-Selection of Artist for Marble Mural	4
3. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Harbour Square Project - Adjacent to Maine Avenue between N and O Sts., S.W. - Proposed Design	4
4. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Medal - Proposed Design	4-5
5. National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. Addition to Building 12 - Proposed Design	5
6. Department of the Interior, National Park Service Marion Park, Res. #18, E St., S.E., between 4th and 6th Sts., - Proposed Landscaping Plan	5-6
7. Smithsonian Institution	
a. National Zoological Gardens, Connecticut Avenue Entrance and Viewing Terrace-Revised Design	6

b. Original Smithsonian Institution Building - Restoration and Renovation	6
8. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission	
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial - Revised Design	6-8
9. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections	
a. Shipstead-Luce Act	
(1) Building Applications (Appendix 1)	8
(2) SL 64-37, 3700 Adams Mill Road, N.W., J.B. & Maurice C. Shapiro - Revised Design for Apartment Building	9
b. Old Georgetown Act, Public Law 808, 81st Congress	
(1) Building Applications (Appendix 2)	9
(2) OG 64-74, Office Bldg. - National Concrete Masonry Institute, 3121 South St., N.W.	9-10
(3) Outdoor Public Telephone Booths - Proposed Design	10

LEGISLATION

Request for Reports from Committees of Congress

a. S.J. Res. 41 and H.J. Res. 181, 88th Congress	10
b. S. 1316, 88th Congress	10

1. The first part of the report is devoted to a general survey of the situation in the country.

2. The second part contains a detailed analysis of the economic situation.

3. The third part is devoted to the social situation and the state of the population.

4. The fourth part contains a summary of the main results of the investigation.

5. The fifth part is devoted to the conclusions and recommendations.

6. The sixth part contains a list of the references used in the report.

7. The seventh part is devoted to the appendixes, which contain the statistical data and the maps.

8. The eighth part contains a list of the names of the persons who have taken part in the investigation.

9. The ninth part is devoted to the index, which contains the names of the subjects of the investigation.

10. The tenth part contains a list of the names of the institutions and organizations which have assisted in the investigation.

11. The eleventh part is devoted to the list of the names of the persons who have been interviewed.

12. The twelfth part contains a list of the names of the persons who have been interviewed.

13. The thirteenth part is devoted to the list of the names of the persons who have been interviewed.

14. The fourteenth part contains a list of the names of the persons who have been interviewed.

15. The fifteenth part is devoted to the list of the names of the persons who have been interviewed.

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
15 October 1963

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, in executive session, at 10:15 a.m., with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: Members:

William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Aline Saarinen
Hideo Sasaki
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: L. R. Wilson, Secretary
C. H. Atherton, Asst. Secretary
C. L. Martin, Counsel
Myra Younker, Editor

Recorder: Leone M. Vialpando

I. ADMINISTRATION

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the September meeting of the Commission were approved as drafted.

2. Date of Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Commission was set for 20 November 1963 at 9:30 a.m., with an executive session on 19 November at 10:15 a.m.

3. Budget Estimate, Fiscal Year 1965

It was reported that a hearing had been scheduled for October 24th with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget to discuss a preliminary budget estimate for Fiscal Year 1965. An estimate of \$103,400 was presented for discussion. This sum would represent an increase of \$12,400 over the appropriation for Fiscal Year 1964, and would provide for one new staff position, some new display equipment for the gallery assigned to the Commission, an indefinite sum for participation in a proposed Pan-American Exhibition in Washington in 1965, and routine increases in travel and office expenses.

In the discussion the members stated that the Commission of Fine Arts ought to play a decisive role in the preliminary planning of the projects

which it was asked to review and comment upon. At the same time they thought it would be unwise to seek to increase the Commission's legislative and Executive authority at the present time. Consequently, it was agreed that as a first step additional funds should be requested to permit an increase in the number of staff positions and improvements to the physical facilities of the office. It was also suggested that the budget should be flexible enough to allow the Commission to engage consultants outside of the Civil Service to conduct special studies from time to time, and to permit the participation by the Commission in joint studies with other agencies.

It concluded that the Commission should request approximately \$100,000 for equipment improvements and \$40,000 to permit employment of two additional staff members, employment of outside consultants and for special studies. It was decided that the Chairman and the staff would study the matter and prepare a draft budget broken down into particular items of expense for discussion with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget.

4. Resignation of Miss Gertrude Sawyer from the Old Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants

The Assistant Secretary reported that Miss Gertrude Sawyer, one of the three architects serving on the Old Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants, had requested that she be permitted to resign her position on the Board, effective November 1st, because of the press of business. The members voted to accept the resignation and authorized the Chairman to send a letter to Miss Sawyer thanking her for her service to the Commission.

EXHIBIT A

It was proposed that Mr. William M. Haussmann, architect with the firm of Macomber and Peter, and formerly director of the Architectural Division, National Park Service, National Capital Region, be appointed as replacement for Miss Sawyer. The Commission voted to approve Mr. Haussmann as a member of the Board.

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. National Capital Downtown Committee

Area Redevelopment Program

The Assistant Secretary reported that on the following day representatives of the National Capital Downtown Committee, an organization of private businessmen interested in the revitalization of downtown Washington, would meet with the Commission to present a program of proposed area redevelopment. No material was presented for preliminary examination.

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

✓ a. Federal Office Building No. 5 - Revised Design

Mr. Karel H. Yasko, Assistant Commissioner for Design and Construction, Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Design Division, Public Buildings Service, Mr. Bernard J. Grad, Mr. Grant Fordyce and Mr. Nathaniel C. Curtis, Jr., consulting architects, met with the Commission to discuss a revised design for the building.

Mr. Yasko expressed his regret that he had been unable to attend the meeting on September 18th when the project was last discussed because he did not fully understand a recommendation by the Commission that the structural system of the building along Independence Avenue be changed. He stated the concept of the building spanning the Tenth Street Mall had been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission two years ago and that it had been his impression that the only remaining question was a suitable design for the facade of the building.

In response to the Commission's recommendation at the September meeting the architect presented a number of sketches illustrating various means of introducing more masonry into the tower building and providing some decorative treatment of the central portion of the building straddling Tenth Street. In each case the mass, height and shape of the building was unchanged from the design previously presented.

The members' comment on the sketches was that none of them met the Commission's basic objections to the design. It was pointed out that the members had discussed these objections at some length with the architects and had recommended that a decided structural break in the mass of the tower building should be introduced at the point where it spanned the Tenth Street Mall, and had suggested that this element might take the form of a glass bridge between the two parts of the building.

In a general discussion the members of the Commission and the architects explored the possibilities of achieving a satisfactory building which would fit within the limitations of the site without dominating the Smithsonian building and other buildings along Independence Avenue. The ultimate conclusion was that a scheme wherein the structure would consist of two separate buildings on either side of the Tenth Street Mall joined together at one or more levels with some form of glass connection should be explored. The members asked that the architects prepare new studies in sketch form for discussion at the November meeting. They stressed that the studies be directed toward a complete redesign of the project which would incorporate the mass of the building in a new form rather than simply breaking the mass of the tower building into two

parts.

(See further discussion of this project in the minutes of the meeting on 16 October 1963).

b. Brooklyn, N.Y. Federal Office Building - Selection of Artist for Marble Mural

Examples of the work of Lewis York, an artist proposed for a commission to execute a marble mural in a new federal office building in Brooklyn, N.Y. were examined. In addition, a sketch of a proposed design by Mr. York for the mural was presented.

The members of the Commission were of the opinion that the artist's work was unsuitable for the project and recommended that the Public Buildings Service arrange for other artists to contribute ~~their~~ work.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the views of the Commission.

EXHIBIT B

3. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

Harbour Square Project - Adjacent to Maine Avenue between N and O Streets, S.W. - Proposed Design

It was announced that Mrs. Chloethiel W. Smith, architect, would meet with the Commission on the following day to discuss the Harbour Square apartment project to be located in the Southwest Urban Renewal Area C.

The members briefly examined a scale model of the project, but withheld comment until the following day.

4. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

✓ Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Medal - Proposed Design

The members examined sketches of a proposed design for the obverse and reverse of a medal commemorating the 250th anniversary of the birth of Padre Junipero Serra, founder of ten missions on the west coast in what is now the State of California. In accordance with proposed legislation passed by the House of Representatives the design was submitted to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association by the Bureau of the Mint and had been approved by that organization with some minor changes.

The obverse design consisted of a full length portrait of Padre Serra holding a cross upraised in one hand and a model of a mission in the other. In the background a Spanish galleon was shown at anchor near the seacoast. On the reverse was a map of the State of California with

representations of ten missions superimposed upon it and the words "Padre Serra's Mission Trail" in explanation. Also shown was a cross and a reproduction of Padre Serra's signature. Around the circumference was a slogan "Always to go forward and never to turn back. California."

The members' reaction to the design was that it was too pictorial and cluttered with descriptive material to be a successful medal when reduced to minting size. They suggested that both sides should be greatly simplified.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the views of the Commission. EXHIBIT C

5. National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

/ Addition to Building No. 12 - Proposed Design

The Commission examined drawings and a scale model of the design for a proposed four-story addition to an existing building located on the campus of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. The addition would serve as an office building and service facility and would be connected to the existing building by a 45 foot glass enclosure at ground level. It was explained that the building would occupy space presently utilized for automobile parking and that its siting represented a departure from the master plot plan approved for the Institution grounds.

The members questioned the departure from the master plan and concluded that they should ask the reasons for it when the architects presented the design on the following day.

6. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Marion Park, Reservation #18, E Street, S.E., between 4th and 6th Streets - Proposed Landscaping Plan

The members examined a proposed plan to re-landscape Marion Park. The park is a long, narrow reservation and at present has a perimeter walkway and a circular planting bed on axis with 5th Street, S.E. The design showed new and wider walks parallel to southwest and northeast boundaries of the park, and two rows of columnar evergreen trees dividing it into two parts.

After examining the plans the Commission concluded that the proposal to split the space into two pieces by placing columnar trees on the center axis was not desirable. They thought the space should be treated as a single unit.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter requesting that alternative

plans be prepared and submitted to the Commission.

EXHIBIT D

7. Smithsonian Institution

a. National Zoological Gardens, Connecticut Avenue Entrance and Viewing Terrace - Revised Design

The members examined drawings and a scale model of a revised design for the project. The revised design showed a considerable change in the approach to the project. It was noted in particular that, unlike the design considered at the September 18th meeting, most of the trees would remain undisturbed. Also the viewing terrace and moat were reduced in scale.

The members thought that the revisions to the design were a decided improvement, but withheld action until the meeting with the architect on the following day.

b. Original Smithsonian Institution Building-Restoration and Renovation

In accordance with the provisions of Bureau of the Budget Circular 11-A (revised 4 August 1961) the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution requested the Commission's advice on a request for planning funds for the Fiscal Year 1965 for the restoration and renovation of the original Smithsonian Institution Building. Included in planned improvements would be an underground garage under the south lawn bounded by the Arts and Industries Building, the Freer Gallery of Art, the Smithsonian Institution Building and Independence Avenue.

After noting that the garage would be under the proposed plaza in front of F.O.B. 5, the members agreed that the Commission should encourage the request for planning funds for the project and suggested that the landscaping would require particular attention.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the views of the Commission.

EXHIBIT E

8. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission

✓ Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial - Revised Design

Prior to meeting with representatives of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and the architect and sculptor of the competition-winning design, the members were given a summary of the events relating to the memorial and the text of the Act of Congress, approved 18 October 1962, which directed the Memorial Commission to confer with the Commission of Fine Arts to determine whether the Pedersen and Tilney design could be changed or modified to secure the approval of the

Commission, and if not, to select one of the other designs in the competition or some form of "living memorial." It was pointed out that when the Commission had conferred with Chairman Biddle of the Memorial Commission and the architect in December, 1962, the members had not indicated that the Commission believed the Pedersen and Tilney design could not be modified or changed to meet the Commission's approval, but had requested the architect to submit sketches showing possible changes which he felt would meet the Commission's original objections to the design. However, because of a lack of funds no further material was submitted.

It was suggested that the members should first determine whether they agreed that the design might be altered to meet their approval of whether it should be discarded and another of the designs in the competition be selected for the memorial. Each member was asked to state his opinion on this question. The general conclusion was that, while some of the members believed the winning design should be erected and others were doubtful of the possibility of changing it without destroying its integrity as a work of art, a decision on this question should be postponed until after they had visited the site and met with the architect to determine what revisions might be possible. The transcript of the members' remarks on this question is EXHIBIT F¹.

Late in the day the members visited the site and viewed it from various positions.

Subsequently, Congressman Eugene J. Keogh, Mr. James H. Rowe, Jr., members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, Mr. William J. Pedersen, architect, and Mr. Norman Hoberman, sculptor, met with the Commission.

Congressman Keogh opened the discussion by stating that Mr. Pedersen and Mr. Hoberman were of the opinion that their winning design could be modified to meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and that he hoped the Commission would be disposed to consider modifications to it.

Mr. Pedersen explained that the Memorial Commission had attached as a condition to its approval of the design a requirement that a likeness of President Roosevelt in the form of a bas-relief or portrait statue be added to the design. Therefore, modifications to the memorial would necessarily evolve in the process of determining the type of likeness and its location.

Mr. Hoberman and Mr. Pedersen were asked to comment on the criticism of the design made by the Commission of Fine Arts when it was disapproved in February, 1962. Their responses are EXHIBIT F².

When asked what the procedure would be, assuming the Commission approved the design in principle, Mr. Pedersen replied that they would then proceed to make the necessary studies for the inclusion of a likeness of President Roosevelt and whatever changes the Commission requested. Thereafter, when the Commission had given its final approval the Memorial Commission would report this fact to Congress, and proceed to raise money to construct the memorial. Representative Keogh explained that in his opinion no further approval of the design by Congress would be necessary inasmuch as Congress had presumably delegated approval of the design to the Commission of Fine Arts under the Act of 18 October 1962.

In the general discussion the members expressed the view that in perspective the existing Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials present a sense of horizontality with only the Washington Monument rising up behind them. They thought the Roosevelt Memorial would be predominate on the landscape because of the proposed heights of the stele and consequently that sense of horizontality would be completely lost. Accordingly, the designers were asked if they would be willing to reduce the height of some of the stele.

Mr. Pedersen and Mr. Hoberman replied that they had often discussed the question of whether the height could be reduced, but that a careful study of the extent to which the height could be modified had never been made. They agreed to consider this and submit sketch material to the Commission.

In executive session, the members agreed that they could not approve the design in its present form, but were willing to consider sketches showing a revision in the scale of the monument. It was also agreed the designers should also be urged to consider changes in form which might make the design more acceptable.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the views of the Commission. EXHIBIT F³

9. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Building Applications (Appendix 1)

The Commission considered the actions taken on Shipstead-Luce permit applications forwarded for review by the Department of Licenses and Inspections, as listed in Appendix 1 dated 15 October 1963. Confirmation was given in each case of the favorable and in the unfavorable recommendation in the case of S.L. 64-47, 1639 H Street, N.W., Albany Pharmacy, Inc.

✓ (2) S.L. 64=37, 2700 Adams Mill Road, N.W., J.B. and Maurice C. Shapiro - Revised Design for Apartment Building

The members examined plans and a rendering of a revision to the design of the building prepared in response to the Commission's recommendation at the September meeting that a complete restudy of the site plans be made stressing smaller scale components in a more open manner.

The revised design showed a reduction in the height and mass of some wings of the building facing the Zoo and Rock Creek Park, but the architecture was essentially unchanged.

The members concluded that the revisions did not meet their objection to the architecture of the building and reaffirmed their conclusion that smaller scale components arranged in an open manner should be studied.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the views of the Commission.

EXHIBIT G

b. Old Georgetown Act, Public Law 808, 81st Congress

(1) Building Applications (Appendix 2)

The Assistant Secretary reported the actions taken, after the recommendations of the Old Georgetown Board of Architects, on the applications forwarded for review by the D.C. Department of Licenses and Inspections. This report was dated 15 October 1963 and comprised Appendix 2 of the Order of Business. After examining the individual cases the Commission confirmed the favorable recommendations. There were no unfavorable recommendations.

✓ (2) O.G. 64-74, Office Building, National Concrete Masonry Institute 3121 South Street, N.W. - Proposed Design

The members examined plans and a rendering of a proposed office building to be located one block north of K Street in the Georgetown waterfront area. Photographs of the site were also examined. The plans showed a masonry building of contemporary design.

The Assistant Secretary explained that the architects for the project were of the opinion that the Board of Architects and the Commission had consistently opposed contemporary designs for buildings in the area and that this design was intended to be a test case. This was not the position of the Board at all and it had recommended that the application be rejected solely on the ground that the building was poorly designed.

The members of the Commission concurred with the opinion of the Board of Architects. They thought that contemporary designs could be

approved in the waterfront area provided good materials and scale were proposed, but agreed that the design presented was poor architecture and should not be approved.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter stating the Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT H

(3) Outdoor Public Telephone Booths - Proposed Design

The members examined photographs of telephone booth design proposed for use in Georgetown and other locations in the District of Columbia. The booth consisted of a glass enclosure for a phone mounted on a pole and surmounted by a lantern containing an electric light.

The Commission did not approve the design and suggested that studies of alternative designs should be requested.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter giving the Commission's views. EXHIBIT I

LEGISLATION

Request for Reports from Committees of Congress

a. S.J. Res. 41 and H.J. Res. 181, 88th Congress

Counsel reported that the Office of Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, had asked if the Commission wished to change its position in regard to bills providing for the establishment of a National Capital Park Memorial Board, whose function would be to advise and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior criteria, guide-lines and policies for memorializing persons and events on park land in the District of Columbia. It was explained that this bill to establish such a board had been introduced several times in the past and the Commission had opposed the proposal on the ground that such a board was unnecessary and would be in conflict with the responsibilities assigned by existing law to the Commission.

The members reaffirmed the position previously taken in opposition to the bills proposing the board.

b. S. 1316, 88th Congress

The Commission discussed S.1316, a bill to establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. The members agreed to support the creation of the National Council, but to suggest that action to establish the National Arts Foundation should be suspended until after the Council had had time to consider it.

Thereafter, at 5:00 p.m., the meeting was recessed until 9:30 a.m. on the following day.

Respectfully submitted,

C. L. Martin, Counsel

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
15 October 1963

AM

10:15

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Approval of Minutes of September, 1963 Meeting
2. Date of Next Meeting:

Executive Session: 19 November 1963, 10:15 a.m.

Open Session: 20 November 1963, 9:30 a.m.

3. Budget Estimate, Fiscal Year 1965

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. National Capital Downtown Committee

Area Redevelopment Program

11:00

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Federal Office Building No. 5 - Revised Design

b. Brooklyn, N.Y., Federal Office Building - Selection of Artist for Marble Mural

3. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

Harbor Square, adjacent to Maine Avenue between N and O Streets, S.W. - Proposed Design

4. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

Medal for Father Serra - Proposed Design

5. National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

Addition to Building 12 - Proposed Design

6. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Marion Park, Reservation #18, E Street, S.E. between 4th and 6th Streets - Proposed Design

7. Smithsonian Institution

- a. National Zoological Gardens, Connecticut Avenue Entrance and Viewing Terrace - Revised Design
- b. Original Smithsonian Institution Building - Restoration and Renovation

3:00 p.m.

8. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission

Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial - Revised Design

(Congressman Eugene J. Keogh, Honorable James H. Rowe, Jr., Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission; Mr. William F. Pedersen, architect; Mrs. Charlotte Hoskins, Secretary to the Commission)

9. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

- (1) Building Applications (Appendix 1)
- (2) Watergate Project - Report of Chairman's meeting with Engineer Commissioner Duke and District Zoning Officials
- (3) S.L.64-37, Proposed Apt. Bldg., 2700 Adams Mill Rd., N.W.-Revised Design

b. Old Georgetown Act

- (1) Building Applications (Appendix 2)
- (2) Office Building, National Concrete Masonry Institute, 3121 South Street, N.W. (Inf. O.G.64-74) - Proposed Design
- (3) Outdoor public telephone stands - proposed designs.

IV. LEGISLATION

H.J.Res.181-1/24/63-Mr.Kyl-88thC-Rpt Rqstd

Providing for the establishment of the Board on Presidential Memorials in the Nation's Capital.

October 30, 1963

Dear Miss Sawyer:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts join me in expressing our gratitude for the service you are now concluding as a member of the Board of Architectural Consultants for Georgetown. The time and effort that you have given to the work of the Board are reflected in the gradual improvement of the appearance of Georgetown, and have been greatly appreciated by the Commission.

With all good wishes for the future and kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Miss Gertrude Sawyer
1640 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20007

22 October 1963

Dear Mr. Boutin:

I am writing in regard to the selection of an artist to execute a mural in the Federal Office Building and Courthouse in Brooklyn, N.Y.

After viewing various designs submitted by Lewis York, at its meeting on October 15, the Commission recommended against the selection of Mr. York for this work and requested that the names and examples of two or three additional artists be submitted for consideration.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Bernard Boutin
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D. C.

22 October 1963

Dear Miss Adams:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on October 15, considered the proposed design of a commemorative medal sponsored by the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association.

It was noted that the legislation, S. 743, authorizing the medal provides that the design shall consist of "suitable emblems, devices and inscriptions to be determined by the Serra Anniversary Association." To leave the determination of these features to the Association is unfortunate, and the members believe that the proposed design is much too cluttered with descriptive material and should be greatly simplified. Whether all the elements of the design favored by the Serra Association can be retained and still meet the objections of the Commission is, of course, a matter of further study.

The legislation is still pending, and there should be ample time to make the additional designs desired by the Commission. Future meetings are scheduled for 19 November, 17 December, and 14 January, and we will be glad to consider any further material whenever it may be ready.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Eva Adams
Director
Bureau of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

Page 10 of 10

The Committee on the part of the United States is not in a position to make any statement as to the results of the investigation.

It is requested that the Committee on the part of the United States be kept advised of any developments in the investigation. The Committee on the part of the United States is not in a position to make any statement as to the results of the investigation.

The Committee on the part of the United States is not in a position to make any statement as to the results of the investigation.

The Committee on the part of the United States is not in a position to make any statement as to the results of the investigation.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM B. ECKHART
Chairman

Committee on the part of the United States is not in a position to make any statement as to the results of the investigation.

31 October 1963

Dear Mr. Wirth:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on 15 October, considered a design for re-landscaping Marion Park, located between 4th and 6th Streets at E Street, S.E.

The Commission was glad to see plans for improvements in a relatively neglected area of the city.

The merits of the proposed design, however, are somewhat questionable. The placement of columnar trees on the center axis of 5th Street would split the space into two pieces and would therefore be undesirable. As a long narrow space, it should receive a treatment designed to give it greater unity.

The members would like to discuss this and other aspects of the design with Park Service architects at our next meeting on November 20. In the meantime it would be helpful if additional studies could be prepared as a basis for discussion. Please let us know by 13 November if this material will be ready in time for presentation on the 20th.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Conrad Wirth
Director
National Park Service
Washington, D.C. 20240

EXHIBIT D

Page 11

The Commission on the Status of Women, established in 1946, was the first of its kind. It was created by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to deal with the status of women in all spheres of life.

The Commission has since then held regular sessions, and its work has been to study the status of women in various countries and to make recommendations to the United Nations on how to improve it.

The Commission has also been instrumental in the development of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1979. This convention is the most comprehensive international instrument for the promotion of gender equality.

The Commission has also been involved in the development of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, which was adopted by the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995. This document sets out a comprehensive agenda for women's advancement in the twenty-first century.

The Commission on the Status of Women

United Nations

United Nations

United Nations
New York
1000
1000

22 October 1963

Dear Doctor Carmichael:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on 15 October, considered the request of the Smithsonian Institution for planning funds for the restoration and renovation of the original Smithsonian Institution Building, and for the installation of a covered garage facility under the south lawn bordering Independence Avenue.

The Commission is pleased to support the request of funds for the purpose. The repairs to the original Smithsonian Institution are badly needed and the proposed underground parking will help to alleviate crowded and inadequate spaces surrounding the building.

The members of the Commission also believe that the construction of this new facility can be tied in with plans for the development of a plaza area and entrance to the 10th Street Mall and Federal Office Building No. 5.

The foreground treatment of the old Smithsonian Institution Building is an integral part of this design, and funds sufficient to study this area in detail should be requested.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Doctor Leonard Carmichael
Secretary
The Smithsonian Institution
Washington 25, D. C.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The University of Chicago, in the year 1911, was the first to establish a department of the history of the United States. This department was organized by the late Professor John H. Coatsworth, who was the first to teach the history of the United States in this country.

The department was organized by the late Professor John H. Coatsworth, who was the first to teach the history of the United States in this country. The department was organized by the late Professor John H. Coatsworth, who was the first to teach the history of the United States in this country.

The department was organized by the late Professor John H. Coatsworth, who was the first to teach the history of the United States in this country. The department was organized by the late Professor John H. Coatsworth, who was the first to teach the history of the United States in this country.

The department was organized by the late Professor John H. Coatsworth, who was the first to teach the history of the United States in this country. The department was organized by the late Professor John H. Coatsworth, who was the first to teach the history of the United States in this country.

FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

JOHN H. COATSWORTH

JOHN H. COATSWORTH
JOHN H. COATSWORTH
JOHN H. COATSWORTH

JOHN H. COATSWORTH
JOHN H. COATSWORTH
JOHN H. COATSWORTH

another look, so it's fresh in our minds, don't you think?

MR. WARNECKE: It is pretty hard to stand down there.

MRS. SAARINEN: I know. I've only seen it in pictures and driven by. I think if we are going to consider this, we ought to go by and take another look, as best we can.

MR. KELLY: Is it important to you, Mr. Chairman, to know how many of us have our minds made up?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think it would be very useful to know whether the members of this Commission think this design can be modified in a way acceptable to us. That's the first guidance.

For instance, if it were apparent immediately that there is no modification acceptable to us, at the afternoon session with them we then proceed to the next stage, rather than having them come back one month later.

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought not to fall again in this trap where we have made certain recommendations to make this change and that change, because they will and we will be stuck with their coming back and saying, "Well, look. We made this change; therefore it's subject to approval." In this sense, it becomes rather difficult to put it in precise terms, and I think it is impossible for a committee to design something like this. We can criticize it generally.

EXHIBIT F'

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Of course.

MR. SASAKI: Is it going to be a working session this afternoon?

MR. ATHERTON: No, I don't think they will present any revised designs. The gist of the letter is they will bring in the design originally presented, to get your ideas. Since it's a new Commission and whatnot.

MR. SASAKI: It seems to me before we have public discussion with them, it would be well to sound out our own opinions.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. We are starting out, for instance, with either approval or disapproval of the previous stand taken by this Commission. Do we think it was a sound one and are we in agreement with the previous decision?

MR. KELLY: I am emotionally excited--I don't think I would have designed it this way myself, but I think it is a good example of a competition won fairly, judged by competent people and I'd like to do anything I could to get it through.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: To get it erected as it is?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I feel the same way.

I don't think Mr. Sasaki can vote since he was in the competition.

MR. SASAKI: Up to this point I have withheld making any sort of comment and also disqualified myself.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Certainly. For a legal vote.

MR. SASAKI: I think in this case, too, I would not vote or discuss it with the architect. Would it be permissible to make some remarks about how I feel in terms of the overall analysis of the design?

CHAIRMAN: Exactly. This is what we want.

MR. SASAKI: I think each of you can decide for yourselves how relevant my remarks are.

First of all, it's the old Beaux Arts lay-out, you know, with the Capitol, monument, Lincoln Memorial, White House and Jefferson here. This occurs as the fifth point in its --I should say it occurs right between --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'll point on the map. Here's the site. Here is the Jefferson, here's Lincoln, White House, Capitol, and the proposed monument is here (indicating).

MR. BUNSHAFT: But you don't feel it's on an axis.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It's the widest open axis we know. It is on dead axis moved a few feet, so you can see it from the White House without the Washington Monument intervening.

MR. SASAKI: Here(indicating) are the Capitol, Washington Monument, Jefferson Memorial. So anything in an appositive form, of course, would be the next competitive monument occurring between, within this overall form of the city and that's the principal basis, it seems to me, of how you start out a design and so it seems as though instead of

starting with another physical positive form, you would start out with something in between or the interstices would be a negative sort of thing, so again a positive sort of thing or a need to fill in between the landscape --so somehow or other, this decides the basic issue of the solution.

Now the next thing you say, well, these monuments, whether these we have here in Washington or others that we know exist throughout the world, they were created during certain periods of certain civilizations and the real question is whether monuments are appropriate today, whether we are monument builders in this day or are environment builders. We are better environment builders, probably, than we are memorial builders.

If you look at FDR as a person, too, you realize he himself was this way. He worked with people. He was the first one who came up with the notion of the common man, not the individual great monarch or leader or what have you, so again it comes to a situation where you wonder whether an assertive monument of this nature is especially appropriate.

As a matter of fact, I think he said all he wanted was a little plaque stuck in a corner; he did not want a monument.

These are the basic factors, it seems to me, which would be considered.

Now, despite these feelings I have, I think in

looking into my own conscience, I'm not the judge or the jury member; as Burnham said, the competition was a fair one. They were good people as jury members. So therefore, in that sense, it's a real question of whether we, because of this peculiar situation and because we do have this power to overrule the jury members, whether we should or not.

So I would say this Commission is caught in this dilemma whether you contradict the jury members or whether there's an overall larger responsibility given to this.

Are we a jury of jurors, really? This is why I say I don't want to vote on this issue.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think each of us ought to be heard from before we argue on it. So Ted, would you state your views?

MR. ROSZAK: Number one, I think while we inherit a certain classic formation, actual relationships, it seems to me, are extremely limited on our part if we have to forever honor these limitations and not realize that within the classic pattern, other relationships are possible and valid. And I would like to be open to the time when we can take issue with certain classic patterns, modify them or perhaps, indeed, impose upon them because otherwise our hands are tied with a certain kind of organizational thinking that no longer is valid for us today.

In other words, I'm for keeping this a flexible and

open issue, so this does not necessarily become an argument simply because at this point of development, this is contrary to the interests of a classic organization, because if this is a point of interruption in the Beaux Art pattern, it might also set a precedent for another kind of relationship on the other side of the established pattern and that way open up all other possibilities, rather than restricting them. So much for the rigid pattern.

I think we should not be entirely limited to it.

To come back to Sasaki's point about Roosevelt's own intention, I doubt if a memorial ever erected reflects the exact personal wishes of the personality involved. I mean, Roosevelt wanted a little stone, but we know he had a grandiose sense of history and he always did things with history in mind. We always knew from his actions, his writings, from his own personal archives that he had a sense of glory behind his actions and his name, so that I am sure if you were to get a true picture of the kind of spirit which pushed a man like Roosevelt, I doubt if there would ever be any kind of monument equitable to his feelings, so anything we do in the way of grandiose statements would possibly be minimized according to the way he sought to measure himself in relationship to history.

Now, looking at the model and I think this is unfair; I think this requires more than just a passing and

cursory judgment on an important thing of this kind; and frankly, my own feelings are divided. Number one, they are divided because I realize the stodgy atmosphere in Washington is such a predicament that a bit of fresh air in the way of a new kind of innovation is certainly welcome, and to some degree this memorial suggests a departure from the classic patterns.

In this sense, I think it's a good thing.

I have personal reservations about its plastic relationship. In other words, I don't think this has been resolved in the best plastic sense from a purely visual point of view, or the architectronic elements that make it up.

This is debatable and I'd welcome any further discussion on this point.

There are other details that need to be considered. For example, it seems to me the idea of topography and the whole ideas of letters is a very moot consideration in this monolithic kind of open design.

And finally, I do believe since we've been talking about the importance of scale and everything thus far, on matters which have come before us, we cannot suddenly limber up and say, "Well, in this case, because it's a grandiose monument for a very important American," and overlook the scale factor. I think again this is important, and I think Aline's point is well taken: We should review the actual site,

and then get down to reappraising the real relationship in scale terms, so we have, as far as my presentation is concerned, three cardinal points upon which to have a decision that is divided.

I would like to reserve judgment certainly not in anything but a tentative sense, until we can get to these essential points and rehearse them and review them for ourselves.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good.

Mrs. Saarinen?

MRS. SAARINEN: I am of a very mixed mind, too, because I happen to think when there is a fair competition, well conducted and run and fairly won, that it's very wrong to disrespect it, because there's no point in having one if you are not going to respect it.

I don't think it's the business of this Commission to decide whether monuments are possible in our time or not. I happen to think they are. I may be prejudiced by the St Louis Arch, but I think that is not our problem and I rather hate the idea that everything has to be a living memorial today. I believe architects can produce monuments and should be encouraged to. I happen to dislike this in terms of its scale and relationships very much, but I think it should not be tossed aside -- I agree with Ted -- without more consideration because I think the reasons for considering it are better. I also think it a very bad idea to have a jury that picks out

one design and another body comes in and is forced, if they reject that, as a next step to maybe pick one that did not win. This is a wrong procedure for us, then, to act as a jury that overrides the jury in that sense, or to change the whole concept; i.e., making a living memorial so I'd say we ought to give very serious consideration, prejudiced if possible in the direction of finding something so it could be acceptable, even though I don't particularly like it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Jack?

MR. WARNECKE: I have very mixed emotions for all the reasons Aline said. A lot of poor things come out of competitions and I just personally don't like this.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Gordon?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, I respect the jury, the committee. It was a very first-rate jury -- the judges -- and I think they spent a lot more time than we are. I think they did a great deal of thinking about it, and I am sure they did quite a bit of perspiring. I think the design they selected, so far as I am concerned, is exciting. I think the problem that once you abandon the idea of having a park, once you abandon that philosophy and go to three-dimensions, if you had a mass of any magnitude, it would compete with these three or four elementary shapes: A dome, an obelisk, and a sort of cube --the Lincoln Memorial. And I think the solution here of having a series of open slabs to

me is a rather brilliant solution for that problem.

The architects did not create the problem. The problem was part of the job. I am for it. I think also I would keep it on this side and we underrate the cut-off lines of trees and things, and I don't think this thing is going to stand up as naked -- in fact, the Lincoln Memorial, you don't see it most of the time as you are riding around the city. It is only when you are on an axis with it, so I don't think these things are going to compete in any violent way.

The other thing is Jefferson Memorial may be on an axis with the White House, but the water being in the way you are not aware of that axis, as much as you are of the other axis of the Lincoln Memorial and the Capitol, and I think an element off center in trees will not be jarring.

The only thing I'd like to see, I would like to see it improved, a condition on materials and detailing that is done that is submitted for us. I think concrete and this sort of plaster model is certainly not what could be achieved. It could be a concrete thing with special detailing and lettering to give it great quality and we've had that problem ourselves. When you see what you can do with different textures that are now around, I think this could be quite a magnificent thing.

MR. KELLY: Is the Chair going to cast its vote?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The Chair shouldn't. The Chair

wants to make one observation. I think it would be tragic to erect such an important building merely because it won a competition. To me this is faulty reasoning in changing the shape and design of Washington because it won the competition. It has to be justified, I think, much better than this. I'd hate to drive there in future years and have people say, "Why is it there?"

"Well, we didn't like it, but it won the competition."

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think it won the competition because it had an excellent jury and I don't think we ought to act like we are superior in our taste and judgment to that jury which spent about a week on that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We don't have to assume the jury placed the same standards to it that we do. Our Commission has a broader concept of the totality of Washington. There is no reason to assume that the jury had the same; within a limited design we might all have approved the same design exactly as it stands without considering the totality of Washington, I mean, possibly. We have a philosophic right to override them if we wish. Our Commission is a broader Commission.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The jury had a choice in this of very brilliant design by Mr. Sasaki, which would not have disturbed the third dimension in a broad sense at all and I think the jury was very well aware of these conflicts we're

talking about --if they are conflicts. And I don't know what their judgment was in selecting this over Mr. Sasaki's. I think it's a low thing versus a park --

MRS. SAARINEN: I think philosophically he was right, but I don't think we're the ones to come in and say that.

MR. WARNECKE: I talked to Pietro Belluschi who was in Honolulu immediately after this thing was decided, and if you've been on a jury you end up with picking the very best in your own conscience of the designs submitted. Your job is to pick and select the best of the designs submitted. In effect he was apologizing in some respect, where he said there were relatively few good designs out of five hundred or so, and that he himself was of very mixed emotions about this, except as Chairman and feeling responsible in an architectural thing, he felt he must defend it publicly.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, but my point is we can't abrogate our responsibility merely because a jury has made its decision. Our responsibility is overriding everyone else's.

MR. KELLY: This is a beautiful illustration of exactly the problem we're going to come up against for a long time. One might as well push it a little further. I would agree absolutely we could not abrogate our responsibility. On the other hand, if we want to get good design in Washington, I feel very strongly we ought to have a line in which we feel responsible if things are worse than that, but if things are

better that we try to encourage good designers to do it in a way that might not concur with our own approaches.

In short, I don't think we ought to exercise this responsibility right up to the end, but only up to what you might call an acceptable dimension, and from there on in, I think we ought to be quite sure we allow people to create things that might differ from what we'd like to see because, in the end, it may be that when it's built, the people opposed to it might be very enthusiastic about it.

MRS. SAARINEN: Isn't this point, though, a very important one that we are concerned with scale, mass and relationships in all our work and why should we not be concerned about it in this case? And that's why I think we shouldn't tell the architects what to do but if we do feel the scale and materials are wrong in terms of a total problem, that we can say those things and let them see if they want to revise?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Congress has asked us to do that specifically.

We've really been having a run-through. The F.O. The FOE 5 men have been waiting a half-hour. We are going to have an hour of this, this afternoon. We ought to have them come in and turn to that.

- - -

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Karel, do you wish to take over the floor?

I would like to review very briefly the criticisms that were made by the Fine Arts Commission in the last round, simply so that they are in front of all of you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We had them read to the Commission this morning.

MR. PEDERSEN: You did? Then there is no sense--

MRS. SAARINEN: Wouldn't we be interested in Mr. Pedersen's reactions to them?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Any comments you want to make on those, great. But we read the record.

MR. PEDERSEN: I will comment and hope Mr. Hoberman will comment, too.

As to the materials, this winning design is conceived of as a huge piece of sculpture on a podium which is integral to it; and we felt very strongly that this should be a sculptural total and which is best expressed in concrete, where you have the palm in the hand and the thing is going up. It should be done in concrete. Fortunately, time is with us here because there are more and more examples of good concrete with various surfaces and aggregates available to us.

We always thought we'd do a number of study panels within the area of design for color, texture, and so on.

There's absolutely no question in my mind about the durability of the material we'd have, working with our

engineers, Armann & Whitney, who have devised a pattern of expansion joints and so on, so whatever interior stresses there were within the thing would be taken care of in their pattern of joints.

Architect after architect in the country is using exposed concrete for their buildings and in my mind, I think there's no question at all about the durability of materials.

The design was criticized for its great size and height as a competing monument to the other monuments; In other words, that it would compete, rather than supplement the three other memorials with which it is required it be harmonious.

The concept of this memorial was truly to be complementary in modern terms; but to be complementary, the volumetrics of this memorial are essentially the same as the other. The two comparable buildings are closed elements. This is an open element. It was conceived of as an open element in the landscape. You could walk through, see through. It was a fluid thing between the two other closed things.

The height actually is a rather specious argument because we are truly only 40 or 50 feet; and only the highest element, the average height of the pylons is less than the other two memorials. And you have complete openness, so, as you walk around it and through it, you're not going to have the

same type of volume and big thing in the landscape that you have in the others.

Finally, a criticism was made that the design is lacking in repose, an essential element in memorial art and did not have the qualities of monumental permanence that are the essence of the three memorials.

Well, all I can say to that is we do think this has repose within the terms of our mid-century design; that this is not a World Fair kind of thing or a transitory thing.

We think it has complete validity, that it's an important architectural effort. It is expressive of architectural thought of this period and time; and we think actually that in these big steles you have a kind of timeless feeling which many other architects have commented on. It's just not a jazzy or inappropriate thing in my opinion.

I would like to re-emphasize that we do have the statue to put in or near the memorial, and we do have some area of redesign in here. We do not feel that the design is sort of one you want to walk away from in any way. We think the design is good. We want to live with it. We want to develop it and we think it would make a great monument, really complementary to the others.

Norman, you have something to add to this, I'm sure.

MR. HOBBERMAN: You've covered most of it, I think,

fairly well. We believe very firmly in our design and the only thing I want to add is a few remarks about the concept of repose, the point the previous Commission made that the new monument should have the same repose as the other three memorials, in order to be harmonious.

As we understand this, this repose they are talking about is a contained spacial experience. It's something you are either inside or outside of; and when we started to work on the memorial, the first thing we did was to reject exactly this conception of what a memorial should be. We decided, first in terms of site analysis, that the thing we wanted to happen here was to develop something that was a link in West Potomac Park between what happened at the Jefferson Memorial and what happened at the Lincoln Memorial, and also the walk around the Tidal Basin, so we knew immediately this was something people would be going through from our own point of view.

Also, that pointed to a consequence that since people are passing through the memorial, it should have the appearance of accessibility at almost any point and, in fact, be accessible in as many points as possible.

Another consequence of this original assumption was that there would be no pre-determined sequence of spacial movement as well as no entrance to the memorial, as such. The entire concept of this was entirely out of the realm

of a thing which was in any sense self-contained, but this was simply an event which occurred to somebody who was passing through a park.

This also, in terms of the concept of the memorial itself, the whole idea of openness and accessibility, we felt were very appropriate to a memorial to one of our great Democratic Presidents, so that in a sense what I think the previous Commission was talking about in terms of repose really was something which should not have been added to the requirements of the program; that what this particular site and these relationships required was something which was intimately married to the site and something through which the site would always be visible and through which people could always pass.

In terms of size and height, there our feeling was we were looking for something that was an equivalent to specifically the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials. Since this was also a memorial to a President on the site, we did not see any reason to really change the general character of the dimensions of the new memorial; although by itself very different of character, its openness, we felt, would prevent any sort of actual clash or any competition with the other memorials.

Now does it in any way conflict with Washington Monument, obviously, since its so much lower than the Washington

17 October 1963

Dear Mr. Biddle:

By direction of Congress, the Fine Arts Commission met on October 15 with representatives of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to discuss the design which was rejected on February 21, 1962.

After lengthy discussion and a tour of the proposed site, the Fine Arts Commission decided that it would be willing to consider a revision which reduced the monument's scale.

The Fine Arts Commission wishes to make it clear that this is not to be construed as conditional approval of the design. In conversation with members of your Commission, members of the Fine Arts Commission expressed the hope that in revising the scale a re-study might result in other changes which would make the design more acceptable.

Some such re-study would be necessary, in any case, due to the fact that your Commission wishes to add a statue of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to the existing plan.

With best wishes,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Francis Biddle
Chairman
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial
Commission
1660 31st Street, N.W.
Washington 7, D. C.

Copy to: Mr. William F. Pedersen

October 16, 1963

Dear Mr. Green:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on October 16th gave further consideration to the proposed apartment building at 2700 Adams Mill Road, N. W. (S. L. 64-50).

The revised designs prepared by Mr. Shapiro showed additional reduction in the height of several wings and increased grade elevations around the building perimeter on the side adjoining the Zoological Park.

The reduced mass is a desirable feature in itself, but it does not satisfy the principle objections of the Commission which are matters of design.

The Commission repeated its previous recommendations that the building incorporate smaller scale elements arranged in a more open manner on the site.

We would be glad to consider new studies based on these recommendations at the next meeting of the Commission on November 20th. If the architects and owners of the project wish to discuss a revised design with the members of the Commission, arrangements to attend the meeting should be made no later than November 13th.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent
of Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

Page 10, 11

The Committee on the part of the meeting of 1954
this year meeting Committee for the meeting of 1954
including all 1954 meeting of 1954 (see 1954)

The meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954
meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954
meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954

The meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954
meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954
meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954

The meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954
meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954
meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954

The meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954
meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954
meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954

The meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954
meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954
meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954 meeting of 1954

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

October 15, 1963

Dear Mr. Green:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on October 15th, considered preliminary designs for a five-story office building proposed at 3121 South Street, N. W. (Informal O. G. 64-74). The site is on a hill overlooking the Georgetown Waterfront, and is bordered by the Grace Episcopal Church on the west, and a series of small-scale row houses on the east.

After carefully studying the rendered perspective of the building, the members considered that they could not recommend the design in its present form.

The objections of the Commission are not a matter of detail, but one of overall character, and it would be difficult to list any specific changes or modifications that might be made to improve it. Problems such as scale, arrangement of window openings, material, etc., are all involved.

The members would be glad to meet with the architect and discuss their objections to the design.

The next meeting of the Commission is scheduled for November 20th, and if the applicants wish to attend, the request should be made prior to November 13th. In the meantime, it would be helpful if the architect were to explore other alternatives to the design and to present these at the meeting as a basis for discussion.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent
of Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

ANNEX 1

Page 10

The Commission of the European Communities (CEC) has been established as a permanent institution within the European Community. It is the main body responsible for the implementation of the Community's policies. The CEC is composed of representatives of the Member States and the President of the Commission. It is the CEC which is responsible for the day-to-day management of the Community's affairs.

The Commission is also responsible for the implementation of the Community's budget. It is the Commission which is responsible for the collection of the Community's own resources and for the payment of the Community's subsidies. The Commission is also responsible for the implementation of the Community's external relations policy.

The Commission is also responsible for the implementation of the Community's internal market policy. It is the Commission which is responsible for the implementation of the Community's competition policy and for the implementation of the Community's regional development policy. The Commission is also responsible for the implementation of the Community's social policy.

The Commission is also responsible for the implementation of the Community's environmental policy. It is the Commission which is responsible for the implementation of the Community's energy policy and for the implementation of the Community's transport policy.

The Commission is also responsible for the implementation of the Community's research and development policy. It is the Commission which is responsible for the implementation of the Community's education and culture policy and for the implementation of the Community's youth policy. The Commission is also responsible for the implementation of the Community's health policy.

Annex 1

Annex 2

Annex 3

November 13, 1963

Dear Mr. Green:

The Commission of Fine Arts inspected photographs of the sample telephone installation on Wisconsin Avenue and Q Street, N. W. at its meeting on October 15.

The members believe that the smaller free-standing units are more desirable than conventional booths, but disliked the antique appearance which apparently was meant to harmonize with the surroundings of Georgetown. While done with good intentions the result looks foolish, especially the pole and old lantern attached on the top of the phone. A standard installation, painted black and properly located, would be far more desirable in the Commission's opinion.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent
of Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

cc Mr. Egan

[initials]

Don



REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-JUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

10/16/63

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

SL 64-

38 518-22nd St., NW
Densie Trousdell

Enlarge exist. front basem. window; install new window on exist. areaway side. Build new steps to new terrace.

ACTION: App'd., 10/15/63.

39 2500 Calvert St., NW
Shoreham Hotel

Rev. to Inf. SL 64-9. Submitting sample of brick (Ia Salle Range (TK)).

ACTION: App'd., 10/15/63.

40 1801 Sycamore St., NW
Dr. & Mrs. Wm. Campfield

Provide sliding glass doors to form side porch (solarium) on house now under constr. Roof in place.

ACTION: App'd., 10/8/63.

41 2700 Virginia Ave., NW
Watergate Realty Co.

1 s-f, 40 sq-ft sign. Cut-out ltrs. mounted on 8 x 80' brick wall. White ltrs. 2 alternate sketches presented.

ACTION: Ret'd. for clarification & corrections to application forms & drawings. 4 designs for 2 different locations were submitted, & the areas of signs were either too large or incorrectly calculated. Recom. subm. of 1 design, of arch'l. classical ltrs. located on fascia, not to exceed 12" in height. Total area not to exceed 25 sq-ft, 10/8/63.

42 2161 P St., NW
Fireplace Restaurant

Rev. of SL 64-25. 1 s-f 24 sq-ft sign. ltrs. set out on pins, lighted indirectly by fluorescent tube in bottom of raceway

ACTION: App'd., 10/8/63.

43 125 C St., SE
Maurice Rosenblatt

Rev. of Inf. SL 64-23. Alterations & addn. to row dwelling, changing location of entr. & steps.

ACTION: App'd., 10/15/63.

44 2154 F St., NW
Mrs. H. S. Hanback

Install d/h window in door opening using exist. iron lintels above for support.

ACTION: App'd., 10/15/63.



REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-IUCE ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

10/16/63

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

SL 64-

45 800-17th St., NW

Riggs National Bank

2 s-f signs. 43 sq-ft each sign. 1 on 17th St. & 1 on I St.
Non-illuminated cast alum. ltrs.

ACTION: App'd. provided ltrs. are of a uniform thickness of approx. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ " to 2", 10/15/63.

46 201-03-05 D St. - 225 Mass. Ave. &

327-2nd St., NE

Change from originally app'd. drawings per additional print.

ACTION: Ret'd. for determination as to location of brick garden wall in relation to public space. No objection to proposed architectural changes, 10/15/63.

47 1639 H St., NW

Albany Pharmacy, Inc.

2 s-f signs. 18 sq-ft each, indirectly illuminated. Stainless steel ltrs., white neon tubing inside, gray panel. 1 sign on 17th St. 1 sign on H St.

ACTION: Disap'd. Recom. 2 smaller signs approx. 7' long with ltrs. of a uniform height not to exceed 18". Sign to be centered over doorway, 10/15/63.

48 2700 F St., NW

Watergate Inn, Inc.

Replace exist. window with door & install loading platform.

ACTION: App'd., 10/15/63.

49 2657 Military Rd., NW

St. Johns College High School

Rev. of SL 64-1. 1 d-f, 24 sq-ft sign. Scarlet bckgd., natural alum. ltrs. At corner of 27th St. & Military Rd.

ACTION: App'd., 10/15/63.

50 2700 Adams Mill Rd., NW

J.B. & M.C. Shapiro

Rev. of SL 64-37. New 8-story apt. bldg.

ACTION: See attached ltr. dtd. 10/16/63 to Ass't. Superintendent of Licenses & Permits, 10/16/63.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

10/15/63

NO
OG 64-
ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

93 3273 Prospect St., NW
Oliviero Capello
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/8/63.

Pour slab between house & sidewalk for the purpose of affording waterproofing to the front foundation wall.

94 3014 Dent Pl., NW
J.E. & Julia P. Bindeman
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/8/63.

Replace 2 windows with louvers in exist. openings in rear basement & erect 7' split cedar fence & gate to areaway.

100 1511 Wisc. Ave., NW
Per of Georgetown
ACTION: Recommended as revised, 10/14/63.

Rev. of OG 64-81. Resubmission of elevations & details of canopy previously considered.

101 3312 Volta Pl., NW
A. R. Evans
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/14/63.

Replace dangerous cast iron steps with new brick steps matching exist. buildings in block.

Inf.
74

3121 South St., NW
Nat'l. Concrete Masonry Institute
ACTION: Not recommended. See attached ltr. to Ass't. Superintendent of Licenses & Permits dtd. 10/15/63.

Rev. of Inf. OG 3458.. Office Bldg. & garage.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

OCT 1 6 1963

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER
OG 64-

PROJECT

- 71 1050-31st St., NW
Robert Tillman (Off. Bldg.)
ACTION: Recom'd., provided that the words be respaced vertically, resulting in a sign more in proportion to available space & adjoining window openings. Revised design requested, 9/24/63.
1 s-f, 7.52 sq-ft sign. (Plaque) Bronze bckgd., black metal ltrs.
- 72 1230-36th St., NW
Georgetown U. (Laundry)
ACTION: Recom'd., provided that colors of sign are reduced in chroma, in the manner of signs of the early Federal period, 9/24/63.
1 s-f, 6 sq-ft sign. Wood. Red, green, black, & brown.
- 73 2715 Pa. Ave., NW
American Oil Co.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided that no internal illumination be installed within the oval. Locations of new signs to match those of exist. signs, 9/24/63.
Rev. of OG 2996. Remove old signs. Install 2 d-f, 24-sq-ft each signs. Free standing signs. Red ltrs., white bckgd. & red field.
- 75 2731 M St., NW
E. A. Audette
ACTION: Not recom'd. Recommend adherence to cornice design originally approved under O. G. 3424. No objection to other changes as shown on drawing submitted with OG 64-75, OCT 1 6 1963
Refer to OG 3424 (final approval)
- 76 1050-31st St., NW
Robert Tillman
ACTION: Recom'd., provided that the words be respaced vertically, resulting in a sign more in proportion to available space & adjoining window openings. Revised design requested, 9/24/63.
Rev. of OG 64-71. Revised drawings indicating place of sign.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

OCT 16 1963

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

OG 64-

PROJECT

77 3057 M St., NW
Red Coach Inn

Rev. of OG 3265. Place 5 awnings on front of bldg. 3 on 2nd fl. with 30" projection. 2 on 1st fl. with 6" projection. No fixed iron frames or posts.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Recom. no awnings on recently renovated bldg. Their introduction would be a disruptive element in the design. Also recom. restoration of all wood trim to the color white as originally app'd. OCT 16 1963

78 3040 Dumbarton Ave., NW
Garrison Norton

7' rustic cedar fence.

ACTION: Recom'd., 9/24/63.

79 3039-41 M St., NW
Junior League Shop

1 d-f, 8.75 sq-ft sign.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided iron bracket is installed as shown on drawing submitted, 9/24/63.

80 1213-34th St., NW
George Worden

Rev. of OG 64-62. Replace metal stoop & steps at front with brick, install metal railing.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided front line of stoop is recessed to approx. 6 to 8". No additional subm. is necessary, 9/24/63.

81 1511 Wisc. Ave., NW
Per of Georgetown.

Constr. a 1-rm. addn. onto exist. beauty shop.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided rear stair canopy is lowered to 8' above grade with a more substantial corner post, preferably paneled wrought iron, & appropriate detailing on cornice of canopy. Resubmit sketch of this portion of the work, 9/24/63.

82 1271 Wisc. Ave., NW
Henry W. Fisher (Apt.)

Rev. of OG 64-49. Apt. entr. only on N St. brick up 1 window. 2 new windows 2nd fl. N St.

ACTION: Recom'd. as revised, 10/1/63.



REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

OCT 1 6 1963

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

OG 64-

PROJECT

83 3057 M St., NW
Red Coach Inn

1 s-f sign. Old English style ltrs. to be installed against brick with litharge & glycering set off from bldg. 3/8". Satin alumlite finish on ltrs. 11'-4" by 1'.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Recom. revised design, using classical style ltrs. of a uniform height not to exceed 10".
OCT 1 6 1963

84 2920 Olive Ave., NW
Mr & Mrs John Amoroso

Repair exist. front steps & install w. i. hand railings on both sides. No roof.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided bottom rail omitted over treads, respacing balusters appropriately. Iron work to be painted black, 10/1/63.

85 1511 Wisc. Ave., NW
E. A. Baker Co.

1 s-f, tempo. constr. sign, 5 sq-ft.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided sign is relocated to southeast corner of bldg., 10/1/63.

86 1671-34th St., NW
Sampson Invest. Corp.

Rev. of 64-55. Revision in accordance with CFA records.

ACTION: Recom'd. as revised, 10/1/63.

87 1673-34th St., NW
Southampton Invest. Corp.

Rev. of 64-56. Revised in accordance with CFA records.

ACTION: Same as OG 64-86.

88 1675-34th St., NW
Unicorn Invest. Corp.

Rev. of 64-57. Revised in accordance with CFA records.

ACTION: Same as OG 64-86.



REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

OCT 16 1963

<u>NO</u> <u>OG 64-</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
89	3410 N St., NW Ward H. & Virginia M. Tanzer	Remove exist. front entr. door & platform & install window & balcony. Install new entr. door & platform in side yard. Change sash in front wall from 1/1 to stock light sizes. ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest following revisions: (1) Substitute 6/6 sash for 9/9 sash on front elevation. Also lights in remaining 2nd fl. window & French doors to be scaled accordingly. (2) Suggest restudy of entrance-way canopy omitting brackets & lightening the overall effect of cumbersome shaped hood, OCT 16 1963
90	1214 Wisc. Ave., NW London Cleaners	Relocate sign from 1426 Wisc. to 1214 Wisc. Ave., NW. s-f, 24.6 sq-ft plywood sign. Gold-leaf ltrs. & mounting on black bckgd. Plywood cut-out ltrs. offset 3/4" from bckgd. ACTION: Recom'd., provided that sign be mounted flat against the wall & within space defined by brackets. Sign to be centered over door, 10/1/63.
91	1645 Wisc. Ave., NW Mr. Earle, Wigs & Boutique	1 d-f, 6 sq-ft sign, to be attached to lamp post. See OG 64-92. ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Provide accurate scale drawing (3" = 1') showing details of ltr'ing. & other elements of the design, incl. proposed colors, 10/1/63.
92	1645 Wisc. Ave., NW Mr. Earle, Wigs & Boutique	Install 1 carriage lamp bracket on wall. Install 1 lamp post behind bldg. line. ACTION: Recom'd., 10/1/63.

